Remarks

In the Office Action dated February 13, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112; rejected claims 1, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638 to Jones et al. ("Jones"); rejected claims 2-3 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,513 to Saiki et al. ("Saiki"); rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,516,431 to Wagner et al. ("Wagner"); rejected claims 6-7, 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2003/0023867 to Thibadeau ("Thibadeau"); rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of non-Patent document entitled "Device Configuration Overlay Proposal" ("McLean"); rejected claims 11 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,954 to Duyanovich et al. ("Duyanovich"); rejected claims 13, 15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,377 to Yanai et al. ("Yani"); rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,814 to lida et al. ("lida"); rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jones.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants propose canceling claims 2, 3, 6, 17, 23 and 24 without prejudice or disclaimer and amending claims 1, 4, 7-9

and 22. No new matter has been added by the way of the present amendment.

Claims 5, 10-16, 18-21 and 25-27 would be pending upon entry of the present amendment.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18-22 and 27 under 35 USC § 102(b)

Applicants submit that Jones teaches a consumer grade copying device.

Applicants would describe their invention as a professional grade copying device, for the use in computer forensics and security. While Jones is adequate for copying family vacation snapshots it has serious limitations if it were to be used in computer forensics and security. Applicants agree that the current claims are too broad and have modified claims 1 and 22 in particular, to highlight the differences between the current invention and Jones.

One of the key differences between Applicants' current invention and Jones is the current invention teaches electronically isolating device interfaces to help ensure there is no data corruption on either source or destination.

Another key difference is that the current invention teaches reading and comparing data on the source and destination devices and communicating the result to a user. In computer forensic and security work a copy is made of a suspect's drive and this copy is used for discovery purposes. It is of vital importance in this process for a user to know that the copy is an exact copy of the source.

Applicants' submit that the claimed invention as a whole describe a

dedicated function copying device for the purpose of computer forensic and security, which is new in the art.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Jones does not disclose or suggest each feature of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 5, 7-16 and 27 are also improper, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Additionally Applicants submit that Jones does not disclose or suggest each feature of claim 22. Accordingly, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 25 and 26 are also improper, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 22.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Applicants respectfully request entry of the present amendment because the amendment places the application in immediate condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

All Applicants:

By: Suysh Date:

By: Mr. May Date: 5-12-06 Mark Joseph Menz